STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S PEACEKEEPERS: THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

BY

COLONEL NORMA J. KRUEGER
United States Army

USAWC CLASS OF 2001

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20010720 062

The Families of America's Peacekeepers:
Their Impact on Readiness in the 21st Century

by

COL Norma J. Krueger
Army National Guard of the United States

Dr. Joseph Collins
Project Advisor

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: COL Norma J. Krueger

TITLE: The Families of America's Peacekeepers: Their Impact on Readiness in the 21st Century

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 10 April 2001   PAGES: 19   CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

National Guard units have undergone exponential change and expansion to meet the diverse security needs of the nation. In order to meet those needs, deployment of Reserve Component soldiers and airmen in combat, combat support and combat service support units continues at a rate which affects the quality-of-life for their families. These changes bring new challenges to military leaders and to Department of Defense family policymakers and program managers.

Family readiness is important because individual and unit readiness are affected by the degree to which families have developed the skills and attitudes required to handle the demands of military life. If America's peacekeepers are to have the support of their families, readiness efforts must become more sophisticated and must be enforced by senior leadership. Commanders and Reserve Component members will need to aim at a higher standard of caring and quality of life in order to achieve self-reliant families.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S PEACEKEEPERS: THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

LIST OF TABLES

THE FAMILIES OF AMERICA'S PEECEKEEPERS:
THEIR IMPACT ON READINESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The United States military has undergone a transition from an overwhelmingly active-duty force to what is now called by the Pentagon as the "total force". The total force relies heavily on its reserve components made up of Army and Air National Guard and Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Reserve units.

CHANGING NEEDS OF THE SERVICES

During the Cold War, reservists were viewed as a force held in reserve, ready to respond when needed to a major conflict. Throughout that period, reservists were mobilized only four times – the Korean War, the Berlin Crisis, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the Vietnam War. Following the Cold War, members of the National Guard and United States Army Reserve (USAR) are being called to active duty to an unprecedented extent, for peacekeeping missions in Northern Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo. During the Persian Gulf War, more than 250,000 reservists were called to active duty. Just a few years later, our nation called approximately 8,000 reservists and National Guardsmen to active duty for Haiti. In Bosnia, 21,047 National Guard and Reserve personnel have been called involuntarily since 1995; those in a voluntary capacity numbered 16,665. More than 7,100 personnel have been called involuntarily for Kosovo. For Southwest Asia, over 2,800 have been deployed, and some 14,700 have volunteered. The United States military is in the midst of a fundamental transformation as a result of its many peacekeeping missions, and humanitarian relief, and other operations other than war.[1]

Even though the total military endstrength has been reduced by over 33 percent from 1991 through 1999, and the Active Component forces have shrunk by 800,000 troops to approximately 1.3 million over the past three years, the National Guard and USAR have contributed an annual average of 13 million mandays to our nation's call. As of now, Army National Guard divisions are being used as the command element for six of the next eight Bosnia Stabilization Force (SFOR) rotations as part of NATO's multi-national peacekeeping force. The 49th Armored Division in Texas, deployed March 2000 (SFOR 9). Maryland and Virginia's 29th Infantry Division will deploy in October 2001 (SFOR 10), and Pennsylvania's 28th Infantry Division in October 2002 (SFOR 12); the 35th Infantry Division, Kansas, (SFOR 13); Minnesota's 34th Infantry Division (SFOR 14); Indiana's 38th Infantry Division (SFOR 15); New York's 42nd Infantry Division (SFOR 16). Three additional elements, which took part in the Bosnia rotation plan were ground maneuver elements from the North Carolina's 30th Infantry

Brigade, Oklahoma's 45th Infantry Brigade, and the 48th Infantry Brigade in Georgia. Elements of the 155th Armor Brigade, Mississippi, the 76th Infantry Brigade, Indiana, the 116th Armor Brigade, Idaho, and the 218th Infantry Brigade in South Carolina are also scheduled to take part in the Bosnia rotation plan.

ENDSTRENGTH

Table 1 reflects personnel strength reduction in endstrength from FY 1989 – 2000. This is the equivalent of increasing the full-time active component force by more than 30,000 personnel. The Active Army went from 18 to 10 active divisions. The Air Force has reduced its fighter wings by half.

Military and Civilian Personnel Strength (End Fiscal Year Dollars in Thousands)												
	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
Active Component												
Army	769.7	750.6	725.4	611.3	572.4	541.3	508.6	491.1	491.7	483.9	479.4	482.2
Navy	592.7	582.9	571.3	541.9	510.0	468.7	434.6	416.7	395.6	382.3	373.0	373.3
Marine Corps	197.0	196.7	195.0	184.6	178.4	174.2	174.6	174.9	173.9	173.1	172.6	173.3
Air Force	570.9	539.3	510.9	470.5	444.4	426.3	400.4	389.0	377.4	367.5	360.6	355.7
Total	2130.2	2069.4	2002.6	1808.1	1705.1	1610.5	1518.2	1471.7	1438.6	1406.8	1385.7	1384.4
Reserve Component Military (Selected Reserve)												
Army National Guard	457.0	437.0	441.3	426.5	409.9	369.9	374.9	370.0	370.0	362.4	357.5	353.0
Army Reserve	319.2	299.1	299.9	302.9	275.9	259.9	241.3	226.2	212.9	205.0	205.2	206.9
Naval Reserve	151.5	149.4	150.5	142.3	132.4	107.6	100.6	98.0	95.3	93.2	89.0	86.3
Marine Corps Reserve	43.6	44.5	44.0	42.3	41.7	40.7	40.9	42.1	42.0	40.8	40.0	39.7
Air National Guard	116.1	117.0	117.6	119.1	117.2	113.6	109.8	110.5	110.0	108.1	105.7	106.4
Air Force Reserve	83.2	83.8	84.5	81.9	80.6	79.6	78.3	73.7	72.0	72.0	71.7	72.3
Total	1170.6	1130.8[c]	1137.8[c]	1114.9	1057.7	971.3	945.8	920.4	902.2	881.5	869.1	864.6
Civilian[d]												
Army	401.5	398.4	369.6	364.5	327.3	289.5	272.7	258.6	246.7	232.5	225.9	221.9
Navy/Marine Corps	350.2	349.0	331.8	319.5	295.0	276.5	259.3	239.9	222.6	207.6	206.9	196.6
Air Force	258.6	255.4	235.0	215.0	208.2	196.6	188.9	182.6	180.0	174.4	165.7	162.7
DoD Agencies	97.1	99.6	112.4	139.4	153.6	154.0	144.3	137.6	136.5	125.6	112.5	117.2
Total	1107.4	1102.4	1048.7	1038.4	984.1	916.5	865.2	818.7	798.8	747.8	724.4	698.3

[a] As of September 30, 2000.

[b] Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

[c] Does not include 25,600 members of the Selected Reserve who were activated for Operation Desert Shield, displayed in the FY 1990 active strength total and paid from the Active Military Personnel Appropriations account.

[d] Does not include 17,059 members of the Selected Reserve who were activated for Operation Desert Shield/Storm, displayed in the FY 1991 active strength total and paid for from the Active Military Personnel Appropriations account.

[e] Includes direct and indirect hire civilian full-time equivalents.

TABLE 1. PERSONNEL TABLES

Table 2 shows the major force structure for all services and components from FY 1993 – 2001.

Department of Defense General Purpose Force Highlights							
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Land Forces							
Army Divisions							
Active	12	10	10	10	10	10	10
Reserve	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Marine Corps Divisions							
Active	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Army Separate Brigades[a]							
Active	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Reserve	24	22	18	18	18	18	18
Tactical Air Forces (PMAI/Squadron)[b]							
Air Force Fighter and Attack Aircraft[c]							
Active	936/53	936/52	936/52	936/52	936/49	936/47[d]	906/45
Reserve	576/38	504/40	504/40	504/40	519/38	549/38	549/38
Conventional Bombers							
B-1 (Active/Reserve)	0	0	0	36/18	36/18	36/16	36/16
Navy Fighter and Attack Aircraft							
Active	528/44	504/37	456/36	456/36	432/36	432/36	432/36
Reserve	38/3	38/3	38/3	38/3	36/3	36/3	36/3
Marine Corps Fighter and Attack Aircraft							
Active	320/23	308/21	308/21	308/21	280/21	280/21	280/21
Reserve	48/4	48/4	48/4	48/4	48/4	48/4	48/4
Naval Forces							
Strategic Forces Ships	16	17	18	18	18	18	18
Battle Forces	300	294	292	271	256	259	259
Support Forces Ships	37	26	26	26	25	25	25
Reserve Forces Ships	19	18	18	18	18	16	15
Total Ship Battle Forces	372	355	354	333	317	318	317
Mobilization Category B: Mine Warfare Ships	1	2	6	8	10	9	9
Local Defense Mine Warfare Ships and Coastal Defense Craft	12	13	13	13	12	13	13
Total Other Forces[e]	13	15	19	21	22	22	22

NOTE: PMAI = primary mission aircraft inventory.

[a] Includes the Eskimo Scout Group and the armored cavalry regiments.

[b] The PMAI counts given here include combat-coded aircraft only.

[c] Reductions in the number of squadrons reflect consolidations and organizational changes.

[d] A previously planned reduction to 906 aircraft was delayed to FY 2001 because of delays in converting some combat units into training units.

[e] Excludes auxiliaries and sealift forces.

TABLE 2. GENERAL PURPOSE FORCE HIGHLIGHTS

Table 3 depicts National Guard units (by state) deployed from FY 1996 – 2000.

PSRC	ST	FY 1996		FY 1997		FY 1998		FY 1999		FY 2000		TOTAL	TOTAL
		UNITS	PEOPLE	UNITS	PEOPLE	UNITS	PEOPLE	UNITS	PEOPLE	UNITS	PEOPLE	UNITS	PEOPLE
BOSNIA	AK	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
BOSNIA	AL	5	294	0	0	0	0	1	19	3	1	9	314
BOSNIA	AR	0	0	1	36	2	18	0	0	1	23	4	77
BOSNIA	AZ	0	0	1	7	2	14	1	26	1	20	5	67
BOSNIA	CA	1	10	1	125	4	162	2	23	0	0	3	320
BOSNIA	CO	0	0	1	8	1	2	1	137	1	4	4	151
BOSNIA	CT	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	8
BOSNIA	DC	2	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	130
BOSNIA	DE	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	2	9
BOSNIA	FL	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	15	0	0	2	21
BOSNIA	GA	2	18	1	18	0	0	1	3	1	1	5	40
BOSNIA	HI	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	5
BOSNIA	IA	3	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	150
BOSNIA	ID	0	0	2	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	15
BOSNIA	IL	0	0	3	168	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	169
BOSNIA	IN	0	0	1	70	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	71
BOSNIA	KS	2	34	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	50
BOSNIA	KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	1	1	3	12
BOSNIA	LA	1	47	1	27	0	0	1	1	1	7	4	52
BOSNIA	MA	2	43	2	128	1	1	1	10	1	10	7	192
BOSNIA	MD	2	16	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	126	10	154
BOSNIA	ME	0	0	1	35	0	0	1	77	0	0	2	115
BOSNIA	MI	2	178	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	202
BOSNIA	MN	1	31	2	21	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	62
BOSNIA	MO	1	124	1	7	1	8	2	4	0	0	5	143
BOSNIA	MS	2	246	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	259
BOSNIA	MT	1	6	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	24
BOSNIA	NC	3	134	5	270	0	0	0	0	4	166	12	570
BOSNIA	ND	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	16
BOSNIA	NE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
BOSNIA	NH	1	13	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	21
BOSNIA	NJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	1	11
BOSNIA	NM	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	9
BOSNIA	NV	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	1	3
BOSNIA	NY	1	177	2	59	0	0	2	170	2	9	7	415
BOSNIA	OH	3	134	1	26	1	11	0	0	0	0	5	171
BOSNIA	OK	0	0	3	22	2	28	1	2	2	151	8	203
BOSNIA	OR	1	48	2	53	1	10	1	1	2	59	7	171
BOSNIA	PA	2	42	8	148	1	1	2	42	0	0	13	233
BOSNIA	PR	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	21
BOSNIA	RI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	144	4	144
BOSNIA	SC	1	13	2	216	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	231
BOSNIA	SD	1	8	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19
BOSNIA	TN	4	82	2	40	0	0	3	10	0	0	9	132
BOSNIA	TX	1	14	10	319	1	13	0	0	19	658	31	1004
BOSNIA	UT	2	11	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	32
BOSNIA	VA	0	0	5	225	0	0	2	2	0	0	7	227
BOSNIA	VT	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10
BOSNIA	WA	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
BOSNIA	WI	1	3	3	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	161
BOSNIA	WV	1	17	1	9	1	7	1	2	0	0	4	35
KOSOVO	AL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
KOSOVO	AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
KOSOVO	AZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	0	0	1	36
KOSOVO	FL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
KOSOVO	IL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	41	3	41
KOSOVO	IN	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	30	3	31
KOSOVO	KS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	47	2	47
KOSOVO	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
KOSOVO	MD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
KOSOVO	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KOSOVO	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	150	2	150
KOSOVO	NY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
KOSOVO	OH	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	2
KOSOVO	OK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
KOSOVO	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	7
KOSOVO	PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	111	2	111
KOSOVO	RI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	4
KOSOVO	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	4
KOSOVO	UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	8
KOSOVO	VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
KOSOVO	WA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	56	2	56
KOSOVO	WV	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	5	17
SWA	AL	0	0	0	0	2	34	0	0	0	0	2	34
SWA	AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	404	0	0	3	404
SWA	AZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3
SWA	FL	0	0	0	0	2	25	1	76	5	102	8	203
SWA	IA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	102	2	102
SWA	ID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	1	8
SWA	IL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	122	1	122
SWA	IN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	11
SWA	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	0	0	1	21
SWA	MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	25	3	58
SWA	MT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	2	11
SWA	NC	0	0	0	0	2	123	0	0	0	0	2	123
SWA	NH	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
SWA	NM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	7
SWA	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	394	5	395
SWA	SC	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	110	0	0	2	113
SWA	TN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	5
SWA	UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	8
TOTAL		53	2052	76	2328	31	507	53	1285	105	2575	318	8848

THE TOTAL FORCE INTEGRATION IMPERATIVE

In 1997, Secretary of Defense Cohen launched a number of initiatives that began what is now referred to as a revolution in military affairs. He initiated programs to reconnect America with its military and to increase reliance on the private sector through privatization. He also focused the defense department's leadership toward achieving the seamless integration of active reserve forces. Through his leadership the principles of Total Force integration are being adopted. Reservists are being used more effectively in operations and day-to-day work, and reservists are now being considered on a day-to-day basis throughout the Department of Defense.[2]

Reserve component visibility in the military departments, service components, Joint Staff and Office of the Secretary of Defense staff levels has improved significantly, especially as it relates to force-planning processes. With regard to the warfighting effort, the Army Chief of Staff has identified plans to apportion National Guard divisions in our global operations plans.   With increased visibility of National Guard and Reserve issues in the structured decision-making and force planning processes of the department, reserve capabilities and core competencies are increasingly being tapped to support ongoing requirements.   Key examples include:

- A Joint Task Force-Civil Support, commanded by a National Guard general officer, was formed on 1 October 1999 to support the newly established Joint Forces Command. The Task Force is tasked to plan, prepare and execute joint domestic military operations to support the Federal Emergency Management Agency's or Federal Bureau of Investigation's requests for assistance in responding to domestic Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) incidents.

- The Army Command Exchange Program was established. This eliminated integration barriers by having active Army officers command Army National Guard and Army Reserve battalions, and Army National Guard and Army Reserve officers command Active Component battalions.

- The Air Force and its Reserve Components became partners in today's Aerospace Expeditionary Force (AEF), fully integrating in each of the ten new Expeditionary Aerospace Forces.

- The Navy transferred numerous reserve units historically assigned to the Naval Reserve force to the direct control of Navy fleet commanders to improve overall readiness.

—The Coast Guard successfully integrated its Active and Reserve personnel into Team Coast Guard.

PERSONNEL TEMPO AND THE FY2000 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The impact on military personnel as a result of the increase in Personnel Tempo (PERSTEMPO) has been significant. Spending more time away from home station places greater stress on both individuals and families. The Department of Defense has taken steps to better monitor the peacetime tempo of the force:

- Each Service is addressing its specific PERSTEMPO concerns and has developed metrics reported on a monthly basis and derived from the following goals:

a. The Army limits the number of deployed days for a single unit, in a single deployment, to 179. While the Army Chief of Staff will consider extensions on a case-by-case basis, the Army goal is not more than 120 days deployed per year.

b. The Navy manages PERSTEMPO through its deployment cycle of a maximum deployed length of six months, with a minimum turnaround time between deployments equal to twice the length of the deployment.

c. The Marine Corps has established the goal of a unit deployment length of six months and seeks a time between deployments equal to twice the length of the deployment.

d. The Air Force has limited the number of deployed days in a single deployment to 179, and has established a goal of military members being away from home station to no more than 120 days per year. Expeditionary Air Forces are designed to improve predictability and stability by moving to ten Aerospace Expeditionary Forces (AEFs) that are designed to deploy rapidly.

- The Global Military Force Policy (GMFP) systematically manages low-density, high-demand forces to ensure their capabilities are efficiently allocated to each theater based on prioritized Commander-in-Chief (CINC) requirements. This policy also attempts to manage excessive tempo for high demand units, such as the Airborne Warning and Control Systems, yet they are called upon to support almost all contingency operations. GMFP establishes deployment thresholds for these units and makes the Secretary of Defense the approving authority for deployments exceeding the threshold. The policy encourages optimal use of the units across all CINC missions, while discouraging overuse of selected units and maintaining required levels of unit training.[3]

The Fiscal Year 2000 National Defense Authorization Act required all services to start tracking individual deployments with the start of FY 2001. The legislation, signed into law by former President Clinton October 30, 2000, clarified the deployment definition and the

authorized payment of $100 per diem to each servicemember deployed more than 401 days within a rolling 730-day window.

The first phase, developing and fielding a web-based tracking system and training soldiers how to input data, is already in place. The second phase is to field final guidance on managing "high deployment-days soldiers" to meet the Act's intent. The final stage, fielding final guidance on payment procedures, is expected to be released April 2001. Even with these measures in place to compensate servicemembers for high deployment rates, the additional responsibilities and workloads are significant, sometimes making the traditional yearly Reserve contribution-two days each month and two weeks of active training per year, inadequate for mission requirements.

FAMILY READINESS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD)

The issue of family involvement and readiness within the Reserve Components has become vital within the past several years. Family readiness can be defined as a family's ability to positively adapt to and/or effectively deal with the stressors associated with military duties and a military lifestyle. Many factors affect family readiness. Examples of the diversity of potential influences on the degree of family readiness include: family structure, family life stage, current life and development stressors, family perception of unit, installation, and Department of Defense interest in family well being. Fortunately, Reserve Component families are now included in family readiness programs and planning at the Secretary of Defense (DoD) level. The military services evaluate, as part of their routine procedures, family readiness as it affects the Reserve Components. Guard and Reserve units have identified and established a single point of contact for information, referral services and other family needs.

FORMALIZATION OF FAMILY READINESS TRAINING

The 1985 Military Family Act, as was the first legislation to address the importance of military families, created the Office of Family Policy. DoD guidance on Family Policy (DoD Instructions 1342.17, dated 1988) addresses quality of life issues for all DoD components, including the Guard and Reserves. Family readiness training has now been formalized within the Department of Defense. In October 1998, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs implemented a partnership with the Office of Family Programs to develop the "National Guard and Reserve Family Readiness Strategic Plan: 2000-2005." This plan aims to ensure

that Guard and Reserve families are served adequately by military family care systems, networks and organizations. It addresses the following issues:

- Using technology to provide more cost-effective support to families
- Increasing the availability of services to Reserve Component families
- Enhancing employer support to Reservists and improving job security
- Reducing health care continuity
- Reducing costly duplication of services
- Assessing and reducing the impact of OPTEMPO on children
- Enhancing recruiting and retention through mutually supportive family readiness programs

The strategic plan supports four major goals. First, it supports mission readiness through family readiness. The second goal is to develop family readiness programs and services that improve quality of life and support recruiting and retention. The third goal is to provide Guardsmen and Reservists with equitable and accessible benefits and entitlements. The fourth, and possibly most difficult, is to standardize readiness procedures to ensure their families are seamlessly integrated into the Total Force. The success o f this Plan is still being documented.

THE NATIONAL GUARD FAMILY PROGRAM (NGFP)

The National Guard recognizes and acknowledges the family as perhaps the single greatest contributor to the National Guard member's ability to train, mobilize, and deploy in support of State and Federal missions. The National Guard family contributes immeasurably in time, commitment, and support of the National Guard member's acquisition of skills and training. The family's role in both readiness and retention is a critical one. While States and units have seen the impact of this role, the National Guard Family Program, first funded by the Army in FY 1987, serves to give national recognition and support to the necessary partnership between the National Guard and its member's families. This partnership is crucial, and mutually beneficial to State missions and the national defense. The National Guard Family Program at National, State, and unit level is designed to ensure that families are informed about the importance of their role in support of the National Guard, and that families are aware of the existence and nature of benefits and entitlements both in their current status and upon mobilization.

At the time of its inception, the program was developed to meet cold war requirements of preparing families for mobilization. Since that time, the NGFP has evolved to become an essential part of readiness, retention, and quality of life for the National Guard. Each State has developed and implemented a family program that supports both the Army and the Air National

Guard, has established local policies and procedures, and provides guidance down to unit level. Although participation by family members is voluntary, spouses are finding out that the benefits are great when they are actively involved in their respective State's program.

The National Guard Family Program offers the following programs and services:

- Information, Referral and Follow- up, a core function of the Guard program, links family and individual needs and concerns with military and civilian resources.
- Mobilization/Deployment Assistance and Support, addresses pre-deployment, deployment, redeployment, reunion and integration issues and concerns; serves commanders by offering a primary coordination resource agency; identifies problematic family situations and moves to stabilize the situation for both the family and command.
- Consumer Affairs and Financial Assistance, educates families about consumer issues, financial planning, budgeting and sources of assistance.
- Volunteer Coordination. Since the NGFP relies so much upon volunteers for the delivery of program training and services, this element provides volunteer management to recruit, train, recognize, and retain volunteers. State Volunteer Coordinators work with the paid State Family Program Coordinators (SFPCs) and the military points of contact (POCs) to provide volunteer leadership and program implementation and enhancement.
- Outreach seeks out junior enlisted and personnel geographically isolated from their unit; provides family sponsorship for new and high-risk families.
- Guard Family Team Building, adapted from Army Family Team Building, promotes self-reliance through education about the military and skill building training by family members for family members.
- Family Support Groups (FSGs), also known as Family Readiness Groups (FRGs), and Family Assistance Centers provide family member mutual support and service, early problem identification, rumor control, and an important command communication tool.
- The Guard Quality of Life Family Action Plan, also adapted from the Army Family Action Plan, identifies, defines, addresses, and resolves issues from the field which impact on the balance of military service and family stability. Childcare, eldercare, and the Gulf War Syndrome, are examples of qualify of life issues that affect many of our soldiers and families.

\- Guard Youth Development Services, promotes familiarity with the military environment for National Guard youth, and provides opportunities for social interaction, personal growth, and team building experiences. As a result of the impact of members' military duties on their relationship with their children, the Army has funded this program starting in Fiscal Year 2000.[4]

The underlying purpose and concern of the family program is to support the National Guard family in both the military and civilian systems. Efforts are made to assist in the resolution of conflicts that arise for the family as a result of, or in connection with, the National Guard member's military service. At the National Guard Bureau level, the Chief, National Guard Bureau, through the NGB Family Program manager, provides policies, guidance, technical assistance, and consultation to support the development and implementation of a National Guard Family Program within each State. Each State Adjutant General has developed and implemented a comprehensive State National Guard family program, and has overall responsibility to ensure that program standards are effectively implemented. Commanders at all levels implement their programs by instituting and supporting a minimum of one unit information briefing for unit members and their families per year. General or individual orientation briefings on the National Guard to family members, normally within six months of a member's assignment, is the norm. This orientation is offered to the families of personnel enlisting or appointed in the unit; personnel transferring into the unit from another post, or base, State Reserve Component, or unit with different missions and new families of current unit personnel.

At the company or battery level the Family Readiness Group is a key element during times of deployment. The FRG usually consists of a group leader, one or two assistant group leaders, and several POCs. Each POC has the responsibility for several spouses, and there is a phone tree set up accordingly. Whenever important unit deployment information is passed to the FRG leader, the phone tree is activated. In some groups, each spouse receives at least three calls per month from unit FRG personnel. In well-operating FRGs, both the rear detachment and the FRG track family problems from the time they become known to the time the problem is resolved.

To be effective, information and education must be ongoing, and two-way communication must be developed between families and units. Family involvement activities, bulletins, and newsletters mailed directly to families accomplish this goal. With regard to families and mobilization, an environment that prepares the member and his or her family for premobilization is one in which families are better able to cope with crises as they arise.

Members of the Army and the Air National Guard are expected to support and participate in the National Guard Family Program. They are required to keep the command informed of their family status, keep the appropriate mobilization documents and required emergency data updated in their unit files, support newly assigned members of their unit as requested by the commander, forward information and messages to their families in support of the National Guard Family Program and keep their families informed of key personnel information, benefits and programs.

Inclusion of families in unit programs and activities increases family identification with the unit and the National Guard. Volunteers are usually used as a resource for development of the family activities. Some activities include the establishment of informal telephone chains to publicize unit events, and providing child care services during information briefings.

STATE MODELS

INDIANA NATIONAL GUARD

The Indiana National Guard traces its history and lineage back to 1801, older than the State itself. Volunteer militia companies were organized initially as protection against marauding Indians. Today, the State has the following types of units: Field Artillery; Engineering; Transportation, Cavalry; Aviation; Signal; Military Police, Military Intelligence; Public Affairs, Finance, Infantry and Maintenance. Over the past 10 years, units from all over the State have participated in humanitarian and peacekeeping missions. Such units are:

- Battery E, 139th FA, mobilized in 1996
- 176th and 177th Finance, mobilized in 2000
- Company g, 238th Aviation, mobilized in July 2000
- 178th Finance, mobilized March2 001
- Detachment 6, STARC, mobilized 30 March 2001
- Detachment 1, 126th PCH, mobilized March 2 001
- Company B 1/147th Aviation, mobilizes July 2001

Through the efforts of the Family Program staff consisting of the State Family Program Coordinator, State Family Program Assistant, State Family Readiness Group Council, Family Readiness Group (FRG) Chairperson, and volunteers, the State Family Program in Indiana is considered to be one of best run in the country.[5]

TEXAS NATIONAL GUARD

Texas Military Forces trace their history to the "Texan" revolutionary militia which helped create what is now Texas at the battles of the Alamo, Galiad, and San Jacinto, among others. The Texas National Guard has actively participated in every major American conflict and emergency since. From the first cannon shot fired at the battle of Gonzales in 1835 to the liberation of Kuwait in 1991 and the NATO peacekeeping mission in the Balkans today, Texas men and women in uniform have served with distinction.

TEXAS' 49TH ARMORED DIVISION

The 49th Armored Division was organized following World War II when the Army National Guard was allowed to create two armored armies. Shortly after being designated combat-ready in 1949, the 49th was assigned as one of the six divisions comprising the Ready Reserve Strategic Army Force, a first priority reserve component. The soldiers of the 49th came from every part of the State, fought in every theater of World War II and had previously served in every branch of military service. They trained together for the first time during a summer encampment at Fort Hood, Texas, in 1948.

During their ten-month stay at Fort Polk, the 49th made National Guard history. In May 1962, the Texas division staged a massive maneuver that was codenamed IRON DRAGON. This is still remembered as a classic National Guard armor exercise. The 49th was named part of the Strategic Army Corps, the best of the active forces. The division had been selected as a top unit in both reserve status and as a part of the active Army. Today, in addition to its State mission, the 49th capstoned to the US Army III Corps and stands as the only fully functional, reserve component, armored division in the United States Army.

In March 2000, the 49th Armored Division led the Active Component in the historical deployment of Stabilization Force (SFOR 9). The soldiers of the 49th have, again, made National Guard history as the first-ever Guard headquarters for the nearly 5-year-old NATO peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. Of the over 600 soldiers deployed, the total number of crises centered around family issues was 173. The Texas Family Program volunteer staff played a vital part in the management of these crises:

-Red Cross
- Death of immediate family member...................................5
- Hospitalization of immediate family member.....................8

- Legal

- Divorces..3
- Power of Attorneys..lost, missing, other......................8
- Child Support, non-payment, refusal to pay, other 3
- Eviction Notices...4

- Chaplain Support

- Coping with Separation..4
- Coping with possibility of ex-marital affairs...............3

- Financial

- Non –shared or joint accounts.................................12
- Changes of financial arrangement w/o notifying spouse.........6
- Soldier not sending money home to spouse.....................4
- Loans (AER) (Credit Union).....................................7

MEMBER/FAMILY CONCERNS

Even with successful Family Programs such as those in Indiana and Texas, concerns by members and their families continue to offer daily challenges to State Family Program staff and volunteers. All States carry out their mission as they focus on overcoming obstacles faced by families of Guard members under their stewardship. The following are just a few of the challenges Guard members face, as they and their families try to keep up with the demands of serving both their country and their community.

FREQUENCY OF DEPLOYMENTS

Continued contingency operations have placed enormous strains on members and their families, and have resulted in a decrease in recruitment and retention rates within the Active and Reserve Components. Although the unique challenges facing the "citizen soldier" are in the forefront of planning efforts by the Department of Defense, time away from home and concern for family members are primary reasons that soldiers and airmen find it difficult to stay in the Guard and Reserves.

SUPPORT OF LEADERSHIP

Communication and information from the command level to the family are key in family readiness and support. In many instances there is a direct correlation between the involvement and support by The Adjutant General of any give State, and the retention rate of its Guardsmen. Several SFPCs report that family members are not getting enough information about deployment-related issues and, therefore, cannot handle crises as they occur.

STAFFING OF KEY PERSONNEL

Due to funding issues, there is only one full-time State Family Program Coordinator authorized for each State and territory. In addition, because of downsizing, staff shortages, and the reduction of full-time staff, some states are not filling this key position. Others have added this responsibility to existing positions like the Recruiting and Retention Manager or the Deputy Military Personnel Officer (MILPO). Several SFPCs have been placed into combined jobs, such as Family Programs combined with Public Affairs or Education Services, and almost all have several additional duties, such as casualty assistance, retirement benefits, special projects, and other kinds of administratively time-consuming activities. This means there is no time for important volunteer training and development and for family member readiness training. The second recognized position has never been funded, and clearly the dilution of the SFPC position has resulted in most programs being marginal, at best.

GEOGRAPHICAL CHALLENGES

Only a small number of National Guard soldiers live near an active duty installation. Therefore, they must rely on the local civilian community for much of their support and the many services for their families. Additionally, Guard families are becoming more mobile and are frequently isolated from relatives. In the past, there were more single members in the Reserve Components. Today, most are married. There are more single parent families, dual career families and blended families. The "baby boomer" generation is aging and has become the "sandwich" generation, focusing on care of children and elders alike.

EMPLOYER CONCERNS

The increased levels of training and frequency of deployments have also had a predictable effect on employers of the National Guard and the USAR. Most employers express great

concern when their RC-employees inform them that they will soon be deploying for several months away from home. Though recent studies indicate that three-quarters of employers are supportive of drill, annual training, and absences to defend other countries or face domestic emergencies, these same studies clearly indicate that their support is very limited.

FINANCIAL MATTERS/ PAY AND ENTITLEMENTS

Leaders indicate that about 90 percent of family problems they encounter during deployment are financial. Too frequently, members deploy without completely explaining what bills need to be paid. They also fail to provide their spouses with access to all of the financial instruments required to make those payments. Family members are unaware of their benefits and entitlements. Additionally, leaders indicate that more than one-half of Reserve Component spouses are concerned about the need to prepare emergency documents, such as a will or power of attorney, prior to an activation, mobilization or deployment.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Community attitudes toward military operations and contingencies continue to play a major part in Guard retention rates. Many do not see the utility in taking care of people in other countries when there are so many people here who need help. Guard families feel the pressure of supporting such missions.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MEMBER AND FAMILY

For various reasons, many spouses of members who are deployed find that they become frustrated because they cannot handle family situations without having to involve the State Family Program Coordinator or volunteers. They feel a sense of helplessness, and are often embarrassed that someone outside the family is involved in personal family matters.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Teamwork is the essential element of a good family readiness program. If certain measures are in place which will benefit families of the members of the Guard and Reserves, those families would most likely gain a deeper appreciation of the military, and will more than likely be more willing to support their spouse in this organization. It is recommended that commanders demonstrate through word and deed that family readiness is a cornerstone of their overall unit readiness efforts, and the staff must support family readiness initiatives by incorporating family

readiness considerations into their general planning. Command awareness is vital, and military leaders must be vigilant in resolving personnel issues in a timely fashion. Other recommendations, although not prioritized, are equally important to the overall readiness of our nation's peacekeepers.

- Soldiers benefit from having adequate time to plan leaves and passes when the operational situation permits such privileges. This gives members an opportunity to spend time with their families during their time of deployment.

- With regard to soldier finances, Command and Financial Specialist Programs should be established to help remedy recurring financial problems, and to improve mission readiness and soldier quality of life.

- Family Care Plans. The implementation of Family Car Plans prior to deployment greatly reduces the number of personnel problems associated with single-parent and dual-military couple soldiers.

-Social activities. To protect unit morale, commanders must maintain a careful balance between predeployment programs directed toward single Guard members and those toward those with families.

-Communication with Home Station. Studies show that up to 75% of today's households have personal computers. Being able to maintain contact with the deployed member via computer gives families a greater sense of self-sustainment, and enables the deployed spouse to assist in making family-related decisions in a timely manner.

-Redeployment Considerations. A variety of activities should be scheduled which are intended to bring their units back to a satisfactory state of readiness, and to afford soldiers a short period of decompression prior to releasing them on leave. Coupled with redeployment briefings administered by unit chaplains, commanders, and FRG personnel, these activities will allow soldiers to ease back into the family setting rather than being thrust back after such a long absence.[6]

WORD COUNT – 4783

ENDNOTES

[1] Floyd D. Spence, "Reserve Forces At a Crossroads"', The Officer, Washington, D.C.; Jan/Feb 2001.

[2] Charles Cragin, "America's Reserve and National Guard: Leading the Revolution in Military Affairs", The Officer, Washington, D.C.; Jan/Feb 2001.

[3] "Annual Defense Report," 1999; Chapter 4, available from http:/www.defenselink.mil/pubs.

[4] Dorothy Ogilvy-Lee, "The National Guard Family Program Impact on Readiness, Retention and Quality of Life." Information Paper, 22 January 1999.

[5] " Indiana National Guard." Available from http://www.ngb.dtic.mil/.

[6] Newsletter No 01-3," Family Readiness," January 01, pgs 10 – 23.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anonymous." Family Readiness Strategic Plan Issued." National Guard; Wahington, D.C. April 2000.

Burke, Stephen and Charles Moskos. "Family Readiness: Applying What We Know and Highlighting What We Need To Know." Military Family Issues: The Research Digest, Volume one, Number One, March/April 1998.

Castro, Carl and Amy B. Alder, "OPTEMPO" Effects on Soldier and unit Readiness." Paremeters 29

Collins, Joseph J. "American Military Culture in the Twenty-first Century." Washington, D.C. CSIS, February 2000.

Cragin, Charles. " America's Reserve and National Guard: Leading the Revolution in Military Affairs." The Officer, Washington, D.C.; Jan/Feb 2001.

Currie, James T. Remember They're Not Replacements: {FINAL Edition}; The Washington Post, Washington, D.C. March 2001.

Cyrulik, James C. and Wolf Kutter. "Army Endstrength and the National Military Strategy." Natonal Security Watch, 8 September 2000.

Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs). Promoting Peace of Mind for the Families of America's Peacekeepers. Washington, D.C., 3rd Edition dated June 19, 2000.

Department of the Army PAM 360-525, Family Assistance Handbook for Mobilization, March 1998.

Doubler, Michael. "Tale of Two Armies." National Guard Magazine. January 2001, 28-31.

Kitfield, James. The Peacekeepers, Government Executive; Washington, D.C. March 2001.

Maddaloni, Chiris. "Army Announces More Guard Combat Units Going to Bosnia." National Guard Magazine, November 1999.

National Guard Regulation, No 600-12, National Guard Family Program, 8 January 1986.

Ogilvy-Lee, Dorothy. Information Paper. The National Guard Family Program Impact on Readiness, Retention and Quality of Life, 22 January 1999.

Pierce, Penny F, and Catherine Buck. "Military Family Issues." The Research Digest, January 1998.

Spence, Floyd D. "Reserve Forces at a Crossroads." The Officer, Washington, D.C.; Jan/Feb 2001.